--The best mode presently contemplated for carrying out the invention in actual practice is illustrated in the accompanying drawings, in which:

Figure 1. ~~(Prior Art)~~ Chemical equation representation for manufacture of sodium silicate.

Figure 2. ~~(Prior Art)~~ Believed polymerization of $Si(OH)_4$ when titrated with HAC. Formation of silica polymer.

Figure 3. ~~(Prior Art)~~ Believed evolution of the polymer in the generator of the invention, with a steep gradient magnetic field with K^+ ions as the nucleus and stabilized by the K^+ and about water.

Figure 4. ~~(Prior Art)~~ Bound water on a typical colloidal particle made by standard activation techniques.

Figure 5. A schematic representation of the believed polymerization behavior of silica.

Figure 6. Electron photomicrographs of silica particles made by standard activation techniques compared to electron photomicrographs of 6a colloid of the invention.--

On page 17, please insert the following text after line 26.

--   Figure 21 represents selected data points, reduced to graphic form from the tests described in the Methods section..

Figure 22 is a representation of the pressure required to drive a flow of 3.2 gpm in a membrane which had been charged with IPE and then exposed to bolus of 500 ml of 5,000 ppm IPE.

Figure 23 is a graphic representation of the data from a membrane charged with IPE processing 72 grain hardness feed water.

Figure 24 shows percent calcium rejection as a funciton of IPE feed.--

Please amend lines 11-33 of page 27 to read as follows:

--a)   PSRO Membrane Results

Figure 21 represents selected data points, reduced to graphic form from the tests described in the Methods section. As may be noted from the curve on feed water, the feed calcium concentration was 4 mg/l. The concentration fell to 3.33 mg/l just prior to the addition of IPE. This change was believed to be due to mixing within the large mix tank used. The conductivity rejection was 92% just after the membrane was regenerated with a 5% solution of sodium chloride. This high rejection rate persisted for about 27 minutes at a feed water flow of 2.25 gpm. The membrane then began to fail and the conductivity rejection dropped by 57% by 50

minutes. When IPE was added at 17.8 ppm, the rejection fraction returned to 83% at 80 minutes and maintained that fraction of rejection. Following regeneration of the membrane with the 5% NaCl solution the calcium rejection was 67%. When the membrane failed, the calcium rejection fell to 23%. When the IPE was added, the calcium rejection returned to 85%. As the membrane failed, the recovery dropped but returned to the original recovery by 90 minutes. Table 1 presents selected data points to demonstrate membrane failure and on-line regeneration and protection by IPE. Table 2 is a comprehensive listing of all data points from the experiment.

b)   TFC Membrane Results

Figure $\underline{22}$ is a representation of the pressure required ~~requierd~~ to drive a flow of 3.2 gpm in a membrane which had been charged with IPE and the$\underline{n}$ exposed to bolus of 500 ml of 5,000 ppm IPE. The feed water was unsoftened and contained 72 grains of hardness (1231 mg/l Ca). Figure $\underline{23}$ is a graphic representation of the data from the same membrane charged with IPE processing the same 72 grain hardness feed water. When a bolus of IPE was exposed to the membrane, the mg/l of Ca^{++} dropped from $\underline{6.6}$ to $\underline{2.2}$. Therefore, as noted in Figure $\underline{24}$, the percent calcium rejection increased from about 99.5 to approximately 99.8. --

Please cancel all matter on pages 30-33.

IN THE DRAWINGS:

Please add the attached Figures 21-24 (formerly Figures 1-4 on pages 30-33).